



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/930,918	08/16/2001	Gary S. Foster	01985-P0040B	2566

24126 7590 01/27/2005

ST. ONGE STEWARD JOHNSTON & REENS, LLC
986 BEDFORD STREET
STAMFORD, CT 06905-5619

EXAMINER

FELTEN, DANIEL S

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3624

DATE MAILED: 01/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/930,918

Applicant(s)

FOSTER ET AL.

Examiner

Daniel S Felten

Art Unit

3624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 November 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Receipt of applicant's Response filed November 01, 2004 with respect to the provisional double patenting rejection citing the need for additional rejections under MPEP 804(1)(b) is acknowledged. Therefore additional rejections have been provided below as a supplemental to the Office Action dated September 29, 2004. Claims 1-33 remain pending and are presented to be examined upon their merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hawkins et al (US 5,497, 317) in view of Cornelius et al (US 6,629,081).

Hawkins discloses, at least as in claims 1, 12, 18, and 22, a system for facilitating the processing and management of a securities trade having a computer [12, 14, 16] (see col. 4, ll. 40-44 and 65+),

trade execution information received by said computer, said trade execution information indicative of an executed trade by a first trading party, and comprising a first trading party identification (see col. 7, ll. 4-9),

trade allocation information received by said computer, said trade allocation information indicative of an ordered trade by a second trading party, and comprising a second trading party identification (see col. 7, ll. 33+),

a database of trading party profiles accessible by said computer (see col. 4, ll. 45+), software executing on said computer for retrieving from said database a first trading party profile based on the first trading party identification and a second trading party profile based on the second trading party identification (see col. 4, ll. 45+).

Hawkins fails to disclose a plurality of enrichment databases having enrichment data stored thereon, and software executing on said computer for enriching said trade execution information with enrichment data retrieved from said plurality of enrichment databases in accordance with the enrichment options of the first trading party profile and for enriching said trade allocation information with enrichment data retrieved from said plurality of enrichment databases in accordance with the enrichment options of the second trading party profile.

Cornelius discloses an account settlement utilization network a plurality of enrichment databases having enrichment data stored thereon, and software executing on said computer for enriching said trade execution information with enrichment data retrieved from said plurality of enrichment databases in accordance with the enrichment options of the first trading party profile and for enriching said trade allocation information with enrichment data retrieved from said plurality of enrichment databases in accordance with the enrichment options of the second trading party

Art Unit: 3624

profile (see Cornelius, Abstract; col. 3, ll. 31-54; col. 11, ll. 29-54; col. 27, ll. 30-63). It would have been obvious for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to provide information to enrich trade information of Hawkins (as cited above and taught in Cornelius) because an artisan at the time of the invention would have contemplated using additional information to make more informed trading choices and develop a stronger understanding what the value is of the securities are being traded and with whom. Thus such a modification would reduce the amount of wrongly submitted trades, improve efficiency of trade execution and thus speed up the settlement of trades with Hawkins.

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US Patent:

Hawkins et al (US 6,247,000) discloses method and system for confirmation and settlement for financial transactions matching

Breen et al (US 6,615,188) discloses on-line trade aggregating system

Kane (US 6,317,728) discloses securities and commodities trading system

Knight et al (US 6,721,748) discloses online content provider system and method

Hawkins et al (US 6,029,146) discloses method and apparatus for trading securities electronically

Keiser et al (US 6,505,174) discloses computer-implemented securities trading system with a virtual specialist function

Art Unit: 3624

Wallman (US 6,601,044) discloses method and apparatus for enabling individual or smaller investors or others to create and manage a portfolio of securities or other assets

Jones et al (US 6,021,397) discloses a financial advisory system

Ward (US 5,463,555) discloses a system and method for integrating a business environment with a process control environment

Li (US 6,832,210) discloses a market neutral pairtrade model

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel S Felten whose telephone number is (703) 305-0724. The examiner can normally be reached on Flex.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vincent Millin can be reached on (703) 308-1065. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



VINCENT MILLIN Daniel S Felten
PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600 Art Unit 3624

DSF
January 19, 2005



VINCENT MILLIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600